

THE GORDON REVIEW

VOL. I No. 2

MAY, 1955

Editor

LLOYD F. DEAN

☞

Assistant Editors

PHILIP C. JOHNSON

C. MILBURN KEEN, JR.

THOMAS H. LEITH

☞

Business Manager

DONALD F. TWEEDIE, JR.

☞

Subscription Rates

U.S. and Possessions

Single Copy	\$.50
1 year	1.75
3 years	4.00

Foreign Countries

Single Copy	\$.75
1 year	2.00
3 years	5.00

☞

Address all correspondence to:

GORDON REVIEW

Beverly Farms, Mass.

Contents

Characteristics of the Christian College

Hudson T. Armerding 43

A Prolegomenon to Educational Psychology

Donald F. Tweedie, Jr. 52

Christian Intellectual Horizons in the Old World

An Experiment in the Netherlands

David L. Franz 57

Old Testament Quotations in the New

Testament (Concluded)

Roger R. Nicole 63

Personalia

69

☞ ☞ ☞

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

DEUTSCH NATIONALISM AND SOCIAL COMMUNICATION

Thomas H. Leith 70

NIDA CUSTOMS AND CULTURES

H. Wade Seaford, Jr. 72

HEGLAND CHRISTIANITY IN EDUCATION

Charles G. Schauffele 74

FERGUSON SIGNS AND SYMBOLS IN CHRISTIAN ART

Robert L. d'Entremont 76

ITEMS OF INTEREST FOR REVIEW READERS

Thomas H. Leith

77

The GORDON REVIEW is published quarterly by members of the Gordon faculties.
Printed in U.S.A.

This journal is not an official publication of Gordon College or Gordon Divinity School. It is rather an independent effort spontaneously undertaken by the persons whose names are listed as comprising the official staff of the publication. The School and editorial staff takes no responsibility for the individual opinions expressed here.



THE WARREN PRESS, INC.
BOSTON 19, MASSACHUSETTS

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

HUDSON T. ARMERDING

This is a discussion of the general characteristics of a Christian college with respect to its nature, constituency, and function. The word discussion has been selected because this is neither an attempt to exhaust the subject nor to claim that every aspect of the subject will either be mentioned or given the particular stress which some may feel it deserves. Instead it is hoped that the article will serve to stimulate a greater interest in the distinctive characteristics of the Christian college.

It is not possible to approach this discussion intelligently without first indicating what identifies a Christian college. The need for this definition has become increasingly apparent due to the confusion which exists in the minds of many respecting its essential nature. This confusion has resulted in part because of the claims of some institutions to be Christian when in fact this is questionable and of others to be colleges when this lacks academic justification.

Within the evangelical community there are a number of institutions which offer post-high school instruction but not all of which are Christian colleges. The Bible institute and the Bible college are distinct from the Christian college. This differentiation is observable in the respective educational philosophies and curricula. At the same time, the Christian college often differs from those institutions which traditionally have been church-related or religiously oriented. This distinction is apparent when the bases for the particular philosophies of education are considered.

The distinctive characteristics of the Christian college show clearly what is meant by this differentiation. Such a college deliberately establishes a starting point or a basis for its whole educational outlook. To the Christian educator no other position is tenable. This is done with the awareness that for some this appears unnecessary or irrelevant. Actually whether admitted or not, each institution of higher learning has some starting point or basis for the educational practice which it seeks to espouse. A lack of awareness that this is so serves to confuse further those who have difficulty discovering for what purpose higher education exists. The presumption of the Christian college leaves no doubt as to its necessary educational postulate.

Fundamental to the educational philosophy of the Christian college is the God who is defined in the Scriptures. To accept the Scriptures as God's special revelation to man and authoritative in their description of the Deity is an act of faith, but to the Christian it is a necessary and workable assumption. The God of the Scriptures is presented as One Who reveals Himself.

Every expression of His revelation, therefore, becomes a major concern of the Christian college both to discover just what such may be and to investigate all aspects thereof, not neglecting any essential element. For example, since the first chapter of Romans indicates that the natural creation is the revelation of the eternal power and Godhead of the Deity, the Christian student undertakes to investigate this creation. The academic disciplines which deal with the natural creation are thus quite properly a part of the curriculum of the Christian college. The Bible also indicates that there is a revelation of God which is found in man. Far from being a super-animal, man is Scripturally identified as created in the image of God. As such he reflects the nature of God in an unique manner. Hence, the study of man is included logically within the framework of Christian higher education. Academic disciplines in the social sciences or the humanities, dealing as they do with man and his activities, are properly open for study by the Christian.

These two major areas of investigation are, however, not capable of truly coherent apprehension apart from the specific revelation of the Scriptures and that unique expression of God found in the person of Jesus Christ. The Christian college, therefore, has the challenging task of integrating the natural creation and the nature and activity of man with the spiritual revelation which God has given in the Scriptures and particularly in the Lord Jesus Christ.

This integration relates man and the universe to God as the creator, sustainer, and redeemer. It is the task of Christian education to observe just how God acts in the carrying out of these sovereign functions. In so doing the Christian college rejects any purely mechanistic approach to education and commits itself to a system of education in which all of life has a coherence which is grounded in the nature and activity of God.

Mention has been made of man as a proper object of study since he is the creation of God and reflects the nature of God in an unique manner. Investigations in the humanities and social sciences continually confirm the fact that there are characteristics and activities of man which cannot be explained on the basis of a sub-human origin. At the same time there is the difficulty of explaining activity which is counter to the ideals which man recognizes and yet seems incapable of realizing. From the Scriptures the Christian scholar understands man to be a marred image of God, yet still responsible to know and in a certain sense to understand God. The significance of man's activity, therefore, is evident in his being related to God as his creator and responsible to God as his sustainer and yet in rebellion as a sinner.

To the perceiving Christian there is a solution to the problem of man's behavior and destiny which is not encompassed by these categories of relationship which have just been mentioned. This is the aspect of redemption. Although man is dependent upon God and responsible to him, he still lacks

that intimate integration which God has always had as His purpose for man. The Christian educator, therefore, recognizes in the study of mankind the need for salvation. In so doing, he makes possible a realistic evaluation of the efforts of man to better himself with a recognition that all so-called progress is relative not only to man's previous behavior but also with respect to man's relationship to God. The Christian is able then to avoid the pessimism which sees no hope for man and the optimism which makes man the measure of all things.

This view of man puts the Christian educator in opposition to those who would posit mankind as the integrating factor in education. Such an approach to education is commonly called humanism and seeks to construct an educational system by assuming simply that men in their basic characteristics are the same and therefore are capable of communicating with one another. Furthermore, it is affirmed that the cultural heritage of man is necessarily valuable and worth transmitting to future generations. Man and his culture are thus the essentials of education. The Christian does not deny an interest in communication between individuals and groups and undertakes the study of various cultures as a proper area for investigation; but, in every case, he evaluates what he studies in the light of God's criterion of the worth and activity of man. It may be seen here that the Christian's approach is not anti-intellectual. Rather it seeks to take into account the theological factors which cannot be divorced from any study of man and his culture.

Reference has also been made to the universe as a proper area of study. Since the universe is a creation of God and characterized by Him as good, it should not be identified as inherently evil and hence unworthy of consideration. Instead, recognizing that it has been affected by God's judgment upon the sinfulness of man so as to render it imperfect in its present state, the Christian is able to consider the universe as a proper area of study without assigning to it an unwarranted importance or an eternal existence. This being so, the universe is not presented as a source of life, either in its simple or complex forms, or as a primary force in the sustaining of life. Instead it is understood to be part of the general system which God has established for the fulfillment of His purposes and which He governs by His laws. Such a view is in opposition to naturalism which makes the natural creation the foundation for its educational system. As was true in the study of man, the Christian educator assigns the natural creation its proper place without either ignoring it or granting it an elevation which is unjustified.

If the foregoing is admitted, then it should be apparent that the characteristics of a Christian college are much more than the scheduling of daily chapel, the offering of Bible subjects in the curriculum, or the sponsoring of extracurricular activities which have a definite spiritual connotation. Every Christian college should include such features in its program, but these will

not of themselves justify the term Christian unless it can further be asserted that every aspect of the instruction and practice is coherently related to God. Such a view also renders incomplete the characterization of a Christian college as essentially an environment. By this is meant an institution which exists primarily to protect its students from evil associations that might injure spiritual growth and development and to reform any who are spiritually recalcitrant. Without question the atmosphere of a Christian college is wholesome. It is calculated to have a positive effect upon its student body so that it may have opportunity to grow in the grace and the knowledge of Jesus Christ. On occasion an individual who has actively resisted the will and purpose of God may gain admission and in his college associations come to commit his life wholly to Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord. It is apparent, however, that such conditions and effects could be reproduced in an environment which by no means could duplicate that of a Christian college.

Hence the environment of itself is not the basic issue. It is rather the kind of education which is being offered. If this is the apprehension of God's revelation as expressed in the natural creation, in man, and in the Scriptures, then the college may with justification identify itself as Christian. For those who would argue that this view tends to ignore Christian practice, there is the response that such practice grows out of precept and is an effect and not a cause. By the establishment of proper areas of study correlated to God, Christian practice is encouraged within a framework designed to promote a proper relationship between belief and behavior.

Directly related to the general characteristics of a Christian college is the constituency which comprises such an institution. Educators are fond of reminding one another that true education is basically a partnership between competent instructors and qualified students in a search for truth. It is generally agreed that a college or university is comprised of a company of scholars who seek to find the truth and preserve and propagate it for the benefit of their society or culture. In such instances what binds the institution together is devotion to a common cause. Admittedly this in time may become no more than mere institutional contiguity or a social, cultural, or vaguely religious cohesion. The Christian college accepts the fact that it is expected to be a scholarly community. Its cohesion, however, is a spiritual one. Hence the criterion for inclusion within its society is first of all neither mental ability nor academic achievement but rather spiritual quality. Educational justification for such a stipulation is located in the word of God.

For example, in First Corinthians, Chapter 2, the Apostle Paul asserts that apprehension of spiritual truth by the natural or unregenerated man is not possible. The only way in which such an individual can obtain the needed capacity is through regeneration by which he is fashioned into a spiritually sensitive being. The Holy Spirit then becomes his instructor. Since a Chris-

tian college is dedicated to the apprehension of truth and its correlation within the pattern of God's revelation, obviously both instructors and students must be equipped for the task. When dealing with the function of a Christian college more will be said concerning the methods by which spiritual truth may be apprehended, but it is well to note here that such apprehension is governed by the same laws or propositions whether the process occurs in the classroom or in some other learning situation.

If spiritual regeneration is the basic criterion for inclusion within the organization of a Christian college, there is justification for the presumption that this relates to the trustees and administrative officials as well as to the faculty and student body. While it is quite true that the first two groups may not be immediately involved in the educational process, they are nevertheless vitally concerned with it. Were they not committed to be obedient to God in the light of His revelation and sensitive to the teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit, they could hardly enter with a proper sympathy or understanding into the problems which accompany the functioning of the Christian college.

A consideration of each of these groups is desirable. In any educational institution in which final authority rests with them, the trustees are a key group. The popular criteria for the selection of trustees are money, influence, administrative ability or some other similar factor. The Christian college recognizes these criteria in its selective process, but cannot permit them to determine the decision as a substitute for the fundamental prerequisite of regeneration and committal to Christ as Savior and Lord. Only with this spiritual qualification are the trustees equipped to legislate policy, appoint leaders and in general safeguard the interests of the college. Historically, a failure to maintain this standard has opened the way for a modification of the institution, changing it perhaps into a denominational or a religious school but one no longer truly Christian.

Virtually equal in importance to the trustees is the administrative staff. Their importance stems not only from their immediate involvement in the functioning of the College but also their power to influence in some measure the choice of trustees and to manipulate to some degree the attitude of such groups as the alumni and others who support the school. In particular, they usually have the power of selection and administration of the faculty and student body and enunciate the specific policy of the school, thus occupying a most strategic position. These individuals too often are chosen simply because of their fund-raising ability or their proficiency in human relations or in academic or educational administration. It would seem obvious that a lack of spiritual awareness on their part would be fatal to the continuance of a school as a truly Christian institution. Frequently the trustees and the general public are not fully aware of what actually is transpiring within the

college and are too often preoccupied with other interests which prevent them from giving proper attention to the functioning of the institution. The general character of the school therefore is developed by its administrative officials, whose devotion to the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ must of necessity be of the very highest.

The faculty are those who enjoy the most immediate and sustained contact with the student body and are therefore strategic in the molding of its thought and attitude. Soundness of scholarship and aptitude in teaching most certainly are prerequisites to appointment to any faculty. From experience most college graduates will agree, however, that intellectual genius or pedagogical skill in the classroom are not the totality of instructional competence. The character of the professor and his attitude toward life and the world are vital in assisting the student to become a graduate who has achieved a proper perspective. The Christian college, therefore, considers spiritual integrity to be paramount among the qualifications of its teaching staff. Vitally associated with this consideration is the fact that the proper integration of all subject matter to God's revelation is the primary task of the instructional group. It is incumbent upon it to have the spiritual endowment to make good this integration in specific courses involving practical situations.

The basis of selection of students for college has been and probably will continue to be a point of argument. A whole series of factors and influences are involved here. The usual standard applied is the academic, for without a certain minimal ability in the intellectual realm the student cannot hope to continue as a member of a scholarly community. Other factors which frequently govern are the abilities of students in the athletic, literary or social realms. Since education is a complex process, these factors deserve consideration. It is the relationship which is established between these and the academic proficiency of the applicant which is often an issue. Occasionally unworthy considerations such as alumni pressure, personal friendship, or the power and influence of the applicant's family enter into the picture. Presuming that the Christian college is governed by principle instead of expediency, it cannot afford to employ these as determinants in the selection of its student body.

Transcending any of these criteria once again is that of regeneration, for the student body assuredly needs a spiritual qualification if the educational process defined above is to work properly. Occasionally this view is justified with the argument that a spiritual environment is of paramount importance. This is admissible only if it is related to the need of the student to be able to enter fully into all aspects of the educational process of the Christian college, something which, of necessity, he cannot do unless he is regenerated. Those who argue that a certain number of non-Christian students should be admitted for evangelistic purposes presumably overlook this.

One other group should be mentioned, those who provide financial support. In higher education today there is ever the temptation to obtain money from whatever source it may be found, because of the desperate need for financial assistance. The giving of money, however, tends to establish an obligation. This can result in the assumption of some type of control, formally or informally, by the benefactors. The *de facto* authority for the policy of the college in such cases becomes located in those who have economic control over the institution's destinies. If these donors are not Christian they are open to points of view which may differ from the declared purpose of the school. In practice this can result in changes in the admission standards or a modification of stipulations governing the hiring of instructors or administrative personnel. Failure to assess realistically the implications of monetary support can cause the Christian college untold difficulties in the years to come. Any institution which makes a policy of soliciting and accepting funds from non-Christians must weigh carefully this possibility and note that there is an historical precedent for the assumption of control by non-Christians whose support became vital to the continuance of the college.

If it seems arbitrary to make the spiritual criterion common to all elements of the Christian college's constituency, let it be remembered that the basic cohesion of such an institution is and ought to be spiritual. Once a group is added on the basis of any other fundamental consideration, the latter immediately becomes a new basis for unity which is competitive with the spiritual.

Having taken into account the essential nature of the Christian college and the criteria which ought to govern the association of individuals with the organization, there remains the question of the functions of such a college. It should be the privilege of those who are part of a Christian college to seek out and declare the truth wherever it may be found. These Christian scholars, therefore, are able to enjoy a true academic freedom when this is understood to be freedom to apprehend and teach the truth. Naturally it is expected that agreement will be reached as to what the truth is. The Christian college does this by establishing God's revelation as its epistemological circumference.

Of the Christian institutions which exist today, the Christian college is in a particularly advantageous position to engage in such academic exercise. The faculty have the needed specialization and they and the student body have the time, ability, and in some measure the resources for the task. Moreover, the college is not bound to serve doctrinal prejudices or ecclesiastical isms. That is why those institutions which do not have a binding allegiance to a segment of the Christian community avoid needless difficulties in fulfilling their objectives. Obviously, every ecclesiastical entity holds views which it is persuaded are Scriptural and therefore true. Unfortunately, other groups hold views which often are diametrically opposed and yet affirm that these

contrary views are Scriptural and true. It may be suggested that a college is able to be truly Christian in position and practice when it gives its adherence to the great propositions of the Scripture and permits tolerance with respect to those doctrines or practices over which since the inception of the Christian church there has been disagreement. Under such conditions the college retains its distinctive Christian character without undue hindrances to its pursuit of truth. In particular this will tend to discourage members of the faculty and student body from indulging in mental reservations concerning certain aspects of the official position of the institution or from contracting a form of mental myopia as far as issues of this sort are concerned. Understandably there is a danger here, but in any living functioning environment, there is bound to be some danger. No organism grows in a sterile atmosphere nor in a completely rigid one. If the basic propositions contained in God's revelation are defined and maintained, the danger of heresy will be reduced to a minimum. At the same time the vigor and strength of the Christian witness will be enhanced, for it will be supported by that which is actually true rather than that which is officially sanctioned as correct.

In pursuing such an educational objective, the Christian college functions to increase the knowledge and develop the wisdom of its students. This is done through formal curricular discipline but is also achieved through every activity which comprises the general program of the college. For example, the study of history, philosophy, and psychology reveals clearly the sinfulness of man, and the study of the Scriptures make manifest that Jesus Christ is the only Savior for mankind. Beyond his own personal experience of conversion, the student gains a fuller appreciation of these facts by engaging in a ministry of witness and testimony to the non-Christian population in the immediate area. Actually observing individuals passing from death to life is most effective in illuminating this aspect of God's truth. Furthermore, if the student has learned that there is a moral and ethical order in the universe, this learning takes on a practical connotation as he evaluates his experiences in a society properly governed by rules and regulations based on such an order.

The Christian college is also responsible for the educative process found in the social and recreational features of its program. Here the college should give the student the same opportunity for growth and development as it provides for him in the classroom. It is inconsistent to treat the student as an adult in the formal discipline of the curriculum and as a child in the general life of the school. If the student is expected to order his intellectual life in accordance with the sound principles of true scholarship, then this same procedure should be applied to his personal behavior as part of the college community. Once again there is a danger in such a procedure. Occasionally a student becomes bewildered because the college atmosphere lacks the paternalistic solicitude to which he has been accustomed. The vigorous intel-

lectual and spiritual exercise which is expected of him may cause him to question his own Christian experience and may reveal such weaknesses as to identify him as a non-Christian. Yet it is questionable whether this is any greater tragedy than such an exposure after an individual has been graduated from college. A Christian college is the logical place for an inquiring mind to raise profound and difficult questions concerning both principle and practice. Sympathetic and competent help is available which may not be the case after graduation. Any college which forbids a free exchange of ideas, which discourages questions and which unduly regiments the behavior of the student must reckon with the possibility that such students will continue to investigate and inquire after college but without the advantages of the wisdom and guidance which the college could have provided.

The Christian college which has an adequate philosophy of education, a redeemed constituency, and a practice which is consistent both within and outside the classroom has an unusual opportunity to develop in the student intellectual and spiritual maturity. This development should result in a mature, well-integrated personality rightly related to God and to the world and having a proper understanding of himself. The sending forth of such young people should have a significant effect. They should be unusually well equipped to present the Gospel of Christ to the unsaved. They should make a valuable and significant contribution to the whole cause of Christ and in particular to the local company of believers with whom they worship. Furthermore, they should be in their local community an intelligent and vital influence for good, promoting those ideals of social behavior which are consistent with the teachings of the Scriptures. Such a Christian college can rightly expect the blessing of God and the support of His people.

A PROLEGOMENON TO EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

DONALD F. TWEEDIE, JR.

In the field of education an effective compromise has been reached between the two great competing methodologies. Both the classical, deductive approach and the progressive, inductive method have been modified to satisfy the twofold requirement of structure and content. There are still champions of the one type of educational procedure to the exclusion of the other but these are presently a distinct minority. The central problem of the status quo is that in the historical process of effecting the aforementioned compromise there has been an unfortunate identification of the progressive method of education with a view of axiological relativity and the subjectivity of goals and standards. This has carried over into the contemporary scene where our culture is threatened by an ethic of immediate utility which is essentially arbitrary. Teachers are trained to inculcate their students with such a perspective and the whole lump is now nearly leavened.

Any reversal of this trend would seem to depend upon a re-evaluation of the present philosophy of education by leading educators. Unless there is a real concern in the thinking of parents and teachers of teachers nothing can or will be done to remedy the situation. However, awareness and concern by themselves will have no effect toward changing the status quo in education. Only an examination of the premises of education will reveal the cause of the present disease and lay the groundwork for its remedy.¹ The remedy must then be applied in the adoption of goals, standards and techniques implied by the proper educational premises. Of these premises perhaps none is so significant as that derived from our anthropological perspective. There can be no educational norms established unless the nature of man, his proper personality development, and the requisite psychological processes by which he may attain such development are known. There is no lack of such psychological anthropologies, but there is a general lack of an anthropology which is consistent with the facts of life and an acceptable educational goal. In brief compass this article will present some of the leading anthropological options with an indication of their implications for education.

1. *The Mechanical model.*

One of the most prevalent views of man held today in academic circles is the physicalistic. Psychologists have striven to attain the respectability of a natural science for their profession and have held as the ideal the accuracy acquired in the physical sciences. Experimental control, repetition, and publicity are the *sine qua non* for every psychological datum. All inner psychological states such as enjoyment, anger, sorrow, and security become merely inept

and suspect names for observable operations in space and time. Every *deus ex machina* is ruthlessly expelled and is subtly replaced by what some feel to be a *diabolus ex machina* — mechanistic materialism. Man is merely a machine. He is a complex collection of atoms and is completely developed and determined by physical forces acting upon this collection. Consciousness and the introspection of its content, as well as the theories of unconscious mental processes and paranormal psychology, are repudiated and their data declared non-existent.

It is true that the aims of psychology should be to obtain prediction and control as well as an understanding of human activity, but to do so by way of behaviorism, or, what is to some a more acceptable name, operationism, is to sell one's birthright for a mess of pottage. The sustained popularity of this theory among psychologists for the last forty years is surprising in view of its theoretical naïvete² and the almost complete irrelevance of its experiments to human activity.

The alarming thing about the theory of this "mechanical model", however, is its great influence in education. Behaviorists are leaders in the field of educational psychology. Children taught by those steeped in educational theory in which there is no place for morality, responsibility, or even the major part of human experience can hardly be expected to do other than bear the fruit of such training in later years. Any educator who desires to evaluate properly man's needs and to instil in him norms of ethical conduct must surely repudiate the physicalistic view of man. In this delimited view all goals are meaningless and personality and character apply with as much, or as little, relevance to automobiles as to human beings.

2. The Phylogenetic model.

The biological view of man advances beyond the stage of a physical mechanism to an organism which has physical components but which is chiefly characterized by a mysterious force called "life". His activity is not determined by the laws of physics but rather by his necessary adjustments to his environment in order that he may survive. Man is merely an animal who has somehow evolved from a minute paleobiological life "spark", but who is more fortunate than the other animals in his language capacity and in the complexity of his cerebral cortex, especially the frontal lobe. With these advantages, man is able to make a more diverse adjustment and sustain more variable culture patterns than the rest of the animal kingdom.

The great popularity in psychological circles of animal study evinces the widespread influence of this view of man. The majority of doctoral dissertations in psychology discuss the observations of the activities of rats or other forms of lower animal life under various special circumstances. There is a strong feeling among psychologists that there is no actual or possible human

experience that cannot be referred to animal study and thence duplicated and explained.³ In addition, when any consideration is given to the human species, this phylogenetic anthropological model as mature is to be understood only in terms of critical adjustments in infancy. Man's needs in life such as happiness, reflection, affection, and security are merely complex and disguised tissue needs.

This view of man has been the prime thesis of contemporary education. John Dewey's great influence in American education has made it a rather general background for teacher trainees. This is a tempting anthropology to some for it accounts for a large part of experience, but one would hesitate to accept it if he reflects upon the vast areas of experience in societal relations as well as religious experience and scientific pursuits which have no discernible relation to tissue needs. In addition, the long line of martyrs for various causes and the plethora of vicarious and sacrificial acts of mankind become an invalidating embarrassment to a theory supposing man to be a mere organism characterized by its inclination to survive. An educational system having a phylogenetic model can hardly hope to have a sound and happy end if the principles it seeks to inculcate in its students, such as loyalty, trustworthiness, honesty, and patriotism, are at best empty platitudes and at worst insidious impediments to maximum longevity which is the proper goal of life.

3. *The Rational animal.*

An anthropological perspective which has been explicitly propounded for at least two and a half millennia and which still has a remnant of adherents, though being perhaps statistically insignificant, is that of the Greek and Roman philosophers. Plato is the most imposing protagonist of the view that man is not essentially a monism but rather a diunity having not only a physical component organized into a living unit but also an immaterial psyche which is much more significant than the body. This psyche is rational and its chief function is to apprehend and to understand logical propositions, i.e., to think. The famous psychological and philosophical problem of the relation between the body and the mind of an individual is pertinent to one who holds such a view.

In this classical anthropology, the degrees of education are somewhat determined in the proportion to which an individual indulges the body or the mind in his experience. The wise and well-educated man trains his mind and resists the demands of the body beyond the nutritive requirements and the necessary bodily exercise to establish physical "tone" and compatible social relationships. The goal of education is the amassing of perceptual events and the subsequent conceptualizing of these facts into hypothetical classifications in order to establish a system of meaningful relations in life. Virtue and knowledge are one and the goal of personality is the life of reason.

The rational view of man is most helpful in its recognition of a facet of human personality which goes by the board in psychologies which are too much involved with the squeaks, squeals, and squalls of machines, rats, and infants to note the rich, conscious experience of human beings as they develop through childhood and adolescence to maturity.⁴ This recognition is not enough, however, even if we enlarge the classical definition of man as *animal rationalis* to *animal symbolicum*⁵ in order to account for human experiences which are not ostensibly logical in structure.

Doubtless many of the practical problems in education would presently be more effectively handled if this classical view were to be the matrix of education. Curriculum content and teaching techniques might well be improved in many instances if educators were convinced that learning is essentially a meaningful experience and not merely a series of mechanical associations or biological responses.

That man is a rational animal is the thinking of many educators today and a concerted effort is being made to rejuvenate education in terms of this perspective. This can hardly be the solution to the real problems of education, however, for the theory does not fit the empirical facts. There seems to be no necessary correlation, for example, between intelligence and morality. The most intelligent person may be a moral pervert, and the most technically advanced nation may serve as a ready tool for a vicious demagogue. In spite of the obvious merits of the rational view of man over the preceding views, it has painful limitations. It is not so much untrue as it is too narrow to comprehend man.

4. *The Imago Dei.*

The Christian view of man is the sole perspective which adequately delineates the nature of man, affords a comprehensive account of his experience, and provides the proper goal of personality. Only the biblical anthropology is broad enough properly to account for man with his physical structure, his biological needs, his symbolic experience, and, in addition, his unique moral nature.

There is a difference of opinion among Christians as to whether man is to be regarded as a dichotomy or a trichotomy, but there is full agreement that man has an immaterial as well as a material part. These components ideally function in an organic unity which is harmonious and productive. Actually, however, there are varying states of disharmony which individuals must strive to overcome. The uniqueness and great merit of biblical anthropology is the recognition of the moral character of man's psyche (this term is used here to include whatever is meant by the biblical concepts of heart, mind, soul, and spirit). The psychosomatic unity of man is a purposive organization and Christianity teaches that this organization has an inherent and radical defect.

Man is naturally self-oriented rather than God-oriented, and this is declared to be the chief root of his problems. The rectification of this defect is effected neither by biological maturation nor re-education but only by a radical re-organization of his psyche. Thus, a biblical view of man entails a remedy for social and personal delinquency not in terms of an environmental change nor an internal resolution but rather in terms of a basic change in the organization of man's psyche whereby through the supernatural power of God he becomes both psychologically and metaphysically a "new creature".

If a man is properly characterized by the teachings of the Christian scriptures, then obviously his education should be adapted to the premises of the Christian philosophy of life. If the only acceptable personality development must be initiated by a paligenetic experience, then teachers must not only be aware of this, but must also actively and carefully labor to the end that such a dynamic event might be the opportunity of each student. If the much needed standards of personal and social behavior are revealed in the moral law of God, then this law should be made specifically and lucidly a prime point of every pedagogical project.

The biblical view of man as made in the image of God is the only theory that can adequately account for man's experiences and aspirations. Likewise, this view alone exposes the defacement of this moral image by sin as being the root trouble in society, and insists upon the restoration of this image as the principal goal of education. An application of this thesis in an educational system may not have a panacean effect upon all the problems of contemporary education, but it might well eradicate a good deal of the aimless, vitiating activity in education which has falsely been called progress and, in addition, bring into the field of education a sense of direction whereby true progress may be attained.

FOOTNOTES

¹ For a more general, yet concise, examination of the premises of contemporary education, cf. Gordon H. Clark, *A Christian Philosophy of Education*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1946.

² Cf. Brand Blanshard, *The Nature of Thought*, Vol. I, Ch. 9, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1939, for an excellent refutation of behaviorism.

³ Allport, Gordon, *The Nature of Personality*, 61-62. Addison-Wesley, Inc., Cambridge (Mass.), 1950.

⁴ ———, "Scientific Models and Human Morals", *Psychological Review*, 54 (July 1947), 182-192.

⁵ Cassirer, Ernst, *An Essay on Man*, Ch. 2. Yale University Press, 1944.

CHRISTIAN INTELLECTUAL HORIZONS IN THE OLD WORLD

AN EXPERIMENT IN THE NETHERLANDS

DAVID L. FRANZ

While we have come to expect important contributions to the content of Christian education from the Netherlands in such fields as theology, philosophy, psychology, and pedagogy, it is not often that we observe the way in which this education is being carried out in Dutch educational life. One of the most interesting features is the effort to bring the witness of a Christian philosophy to university life by establishing chairs of Calvinistic philosophy in most of the important Dutch universities and technical schools.

Stimulated by the translation of the philosophic works of Professor Herman Dooyeweerd and several of his fellow laborers, there has developed in the United States a wide-spread interest in the *Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee* (The Philosophy of the Idea of Law). Though we have thus become aware of the thought of this school it is instructive and interesting to note that this philosophic movement in the Netherlands has given rise to the Society for Calvinistic Philosophy, and as part of the labor of that society there has been formed the Foundation for the Maintenance of Special Chairs of Calvinistic Philosophy.

The purpose of the foundation as explained by Professor Vollenhoven is two fold. By the work of the special professors serving on the faculties of the state universities, the Reformed students attending these universities will have available to them the best efforts of Christian thinkers in the area of sharpest conflict with non-Christian thought. Thus the Christian student need not live in a compartmentalized world of Christian faith and non-Christian thought nor capitulate to a supposedly unprejudiced scientific view of life. (In the year when the Foundation came into existence, there were an estimated fifteen hundred *Gereformeerde* students studying elsewhere than the Free University in Amsterdam, generally because they were pursuing special studies or were forced for financial reasons to attend a university in their locality.) In addition to the task of making available regular lectures and advice to students of Reformed background, the intention of the Foundation is also "to bring the fruit of Calvinism in the sphere of philosophy to him who is alienated from the Word of God or who has never come in contact with it".¹

The type of educational structure that makes this experiment possible, needs further explanation. By the time these chairs were established, the Thomists had special chairs of philosophy at three public universities.

Though full explanation would necessitate a lengthy discussion of church and political history in the Netherlands, several pivotal dates may suffice for

our purposes.² During the great struggle over higher education in 1904-1905, Abraham Kuyper as Minister of Home Affairs introduced a bill which makes possible the establishment of special chairs in the public universities. After long and bitter debate the Higher Education Law of 1905 was passed, and one of its provisions was as follows:

The Crown shall, after the customary advice of the Council of State and the Senate of the State University declare competent incorporated societies, foundations, or institutions to establish a fixed faculty of one or more teachers.

The specific instructions of the bill call for a highly qualified professor to fill the appointment and make provision for his use of university facilities and his place in the university faculty.³

The next event of significance for this account was the appointment in 1926 of Dr. Herman Dooyeweerd as professor of philosophy and history of law in the Free University of Amsterdam and in the same year the appointment of Dr. D. H. Vollenhoven as professor of philosophy in the Free University. While the opportunity for the presentation of a Christian philosophy had been provided by the Higher Education Law of 1905, the working out of the Philosophy of the Idea of Law was to rest upon the shoulders of these two men. Considerable discussion might be raised at this point, and indeed has been, as to the exact contribution of Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven. One can find the enthusiastic evaluation of Spier, who emphasized the pioneering effort of the *Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee* as contrasted with the whole history of Christian thought. Or one can find the more conservative estimate of Young who notes his indebtedness "to what he is convinced is the first serious attempt in the history of Protestantism to give philosophic expression to the basic religious motif of the Reformation".⁴ Or again one can trace with Dengerink the complex strands of thought in the Dutch neo-Calvinistic thought of the nineteenth century, yet to conclude that:

Now, during the last two decades, two professors in the Free Reformed University in Amsterdam have made an attempt to develop the principle of "sovereignty in individual sphere", as it has been discovered again in its universal-cosmic sense by Kuyper, in a philosophical system, which they have introduced under the name of "Philosophy of the Idea of Law".⁵

If we look at the works of Dooyeweerd himself, we are at once aware of the stress he lays upon the principle of antithesis in philosophic thought. "On the basis of this central Christian point of view I saw the need of a revolution in philosophic thought of a very radical character".⁶ In Vollenhoven's work the same consciousness is present: "Synthesis between the Christian faith on the one side and contemporary philosophy on the other is impossible".⁷

In the process of pushing forward this radical critique of immanent philosophy and at the same time developing a Christian philosophy on its own proper transcendental "ground-idea", Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven gathered about them a group of scholars of like mind and in 1935 the Society for Calvinistic Philosophy was founded. The voice of the new society was the quarterly journal *Philosophia Reformata*. Although the movement had a Dutch homeland, contributors from South Africa, France, Germany, and the United States gave the journal an international flavor. Frequently an issue contains articles in several languages and sometimes a single article will have a summary in an alternate language to assist those who may be unfamiliar with the language in which the article is written.

The society organized itself both as a unit and as a group of philosophic circles located throughout the Netherlands. The local chapters are designed to provide for more frequent philosophic gatherings, while the whole society meets annually for a two-day conference.

In addition to the scholarly journal, the society pushed its work on a more popular level by means of series of lectures given in a number of Dutch cities. Although the lectures were intended for the non-professional philosopher, the men who lectured were and are university professors.

Given the opportunity as provided in the Law of 1905, and the leadership of Professors Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven at the Free University, the young society needed only the right moment to begin its activity in the establishment of chairs of philosophy at the various Netherlands universities. The right moment appeared at the close of the second world war in the year 1947. For occupied Holland the war years had been difficult almost beyond the comprehension of the American observer; and the educational life of the country was not at all immune from the upheavals of war. For example, the venerable Leiden University had voted to close its doors rather than submit to the Jewish purge of its faculty by the Nazi administration. With imprisonments, deportations, forced labor, and the disruption of student life by military demands, in addition to the economic ravaging of the land, it is quite remarkable that the educational life of the country responded so quickly after the war to a re-establishment of the old university patterns and the introduction of new advances.

The Foundation for the Maintenance of Special Chairs of Calvinistic Philosophy was closely related to the Society for Calvinistic Philosophy in personnel and publication. Directors of the new Foundation were to be appointed by the Society, and the news publication of the Society began to devote a considerable portion of its space to the new effort. This bi-annual publication known as the *Mededelingen* or *Communications of the Society for Calvinistic Philosophy* contains the pertinent news of the society, the reports of the Foundation, book reviews of relevant publications, and a

number of popularly written articles by members of the Society. By "popularly written" articles we do not want to suggest that the articles are intended for relaxation reading but simply to contrast them with the articles of a highly professional nature and the technical research of the *Philosophia Reformata*.

By 1952 the Foundation had established five chairs of philosophy in the universities at Leiden, Groningen, and Utrecht, and in the technical schools in Delft and Rotterdam. At present, applications for the establishment of chairs at the Municipal University of Amsterdam and the agricultural school at Wageningen are awaiting official approval. From the outset the Society appointed men of proven ability to occupy the new posts. Professor S. U. Zuidema, specialist in contemporary philosophy with a number of published studies on Sartre, Kierkegaard, and Heidegger, was one of the early lecturers selected and has since that time been appointed to the philosophy department of the Free University. Professor K. J. Popma, another of the special lecturers, has done outstanding work in the area of Greek and Christian views in the New Testament and the early Christian period. His books and articles, as yet not translated into English, bear the stamp of his training in classics and philology. Professor H. Van Riessen, teaching in Delft, is known to American readers through the translation of his recent work *The Society of the Future*. His appointment in 1951 to the M.I.T. of the Netherlands, the technical school at Delft, was especially appropriate in view of the extensive work he has already accomplished in the relation of philosophy and technology. (See his *Filosofie en Techniek*⁸)

In a recent *Mededelingen* article Professor Van Riessen speaks of the problems in his work, not the least of which is the task of winning and holding an audience in an educational milieu which knows nothing of compulsory attendance or other devices of the American scene. But the more basic problems are those of relating the technical training of the students to the wider world and life view of the educated man, and especially of the educated Christian. "For it is not the task of the Christian philosopher," says Van Riessen, "to use his lectures only for a witness of his faith and nothing more . . ."⁹ There is the work of systematic development, unambiguous formulation, methodical presentation, and responsibility to the educated community. This demands a thorough critique of existing views and the rebuilding of a Christian philosophy on Biblical principles. In concluding his article, Van Riessen speaks of the enthusiastic attitude of the technically trained students to the contribution that philosophy can make in the task of giving perspective to their studies, and of the friendly relations which he enjoys with the faculty of the school at Delft.

Having described the history and function of the Foundation for the maintenance of special chairs of Calvinistic Philosophy, it is our purpose in con-

clusion to discuss the significance of this movement for those interested in Christian education in the United States.

First, it can be said that there is in the movement a recognition of the true nature of the "neutrality postulate" in modern education. While the desire to avoid religious acrimony in education might seem attractive to many of us, it is certainly evident that to educate a person without reference to God is not to be "neutral" but in effect is to have already decided that the God of the Scriptures is either non-existent or totally irrelevant. In this connection Dooyeweerd's attempt to lay bare the presuppositions in modern thought which mask themselves in the "neutrality postulate", is of great interest to the Christian thinker. Dooyeweerd writes:

The immanence-philosopher has the sincere conviction, that the scientific character of philosophic thought can only be maintained in this conception of philosophy. What would become of the "objectivity", of the "universal validity", of the controllability of philosophic thought, if philosophy were to bind itself to presuppositions which go beyond its own immanent boundaries? . . . All the acumen which the advocates of this standpoint have at their disposal is brought to bear on the demonstration of the correctness of this neutrality-postulate . . . A two-fold pre-supposition of philosophic thought is discovered at the outset. In the first place, philosophic thought presupposes an Archimedean point for the thinker, from which our ego in the philosophic activity of thought can direct its view of totality over the modal diversity of meaning. Secondly, it presupposes a choice of position in the Archimedean point. . . .¹⁰

A further significance of this movement to place trained Christian professors in strategic university faculties is the awareness it shows of the great importance of education in the total culture of a people. The recognition that tomorrow's leaders are being formed today, and furthermore, being shaped by university life, has not been nearly so clear in the evangelical Christian community of the United States. In a recent issue of the *Mededelingen* there is a treatment of this aspect of Christian responsibility.

One of the strategically most important points is education. There, of course, one finds the meeting place between the older and the younger generation. There rages the conflict over the "soul" — that is in this relation: the future life of the child, the young men, the man and woman of tomorrow. . . .¹¹

Thirdly, the ability of the Philosophy of the Idea of Law to move into the arena of vital philosophic discussion is significant for the American observer. The fear has been expressed by some that to apply the principle of antithesis so thoroughly in philosophy might mean the isolation of all conversation between the Christian and the non-Christian philosopher. Of

course Professor Dooyeweerd has argued that this would not be the case when he states:

Nevertheless, this radical rupture with the starting-points and transcendental ground-ideas of immanence-philosophy does not mean, that an intrinsically re-formed Christian philosophy should intend to break off philosophical contact with Greek, scholastic, and modern Humanistic philosophy. On the contrary, because of its radical-critical standpoint, the Christian philosophy developed in this work is enabled to enter into the most inward contact with immanence-philosophy. It will never break the community of philosophical thought with the other philosophical trends, because it has learned to make a sharp distinction between philosophical judgments and the supra-theoretic prejudices which lay the foundation of every possible philosophy. . . .¹²

Even though theoretically the Christian philosopher "will never break the community of philosophic thought" it is still possible to do so in practice. Hence the significance of the attempt to establish chairs of philosophy in the hearing of the non-Christian. Whatever future discussion may determine as to the fruitfulness and validity of the attempt of the Philosophy of the Idea of Law to construct a Christian philosophy on a Biblical basis, the movement has certainly made a refreshingly forthright presentation in the courts of its adversaries.

NOTES

¹ *Mededelingen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte*, Kampen: J. H. Kok, February 1955, p. 1.

² L. Praamsma, *Het Dwaze Gods*, Wageningen: Zomer and Keunings, 1950.

This is a very interesting account of the history of the *Gereformeerde Church* in the Netherlands since the beginning of the nineteenth century.

³ C. De Ru, *De Strijd Over Het Hoger Onderwijs Tijdens Het Ministerie-Kuyper*, Kampen: J. K. Kok, 1953, p. 39.

⁴ William Young, *Toward a Reformed Philosophy*, Grand Rapids: Piet Hein Publishers, 1952, p. 9.

The sub-title reads "The Development of a Protestant Philosophy in Dutch Calvinistic Thought since the Time of Abraham Kuyper".

⁵ J. D. Dengerink, *Critisch-Historisch Onderzoek Naar De Sociologische Ontwikkeling Van Het Beginsel Der "Sovereiniteit in Eigen Kring"* In *Der 19th and 20th Eeuw*, Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1948, p. 269.

⁶ Herman Dooyeweerd, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, trans. by D. H. Freeman and W. S. Young, Vol. I, Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1953, Foreword, p. v.

⁷ D. H. Th. Vollenhoven, *Het Calvinisme En De Reformatie Van De Wijsbegeerte*, Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1933, p. 16.

⁸ H. Van Riessen, *Filosofie En Techniek*, Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1949.

⁹ *Mededelingen*, op. cit., Dec. 1953, p. 6.

¹⁰ Dooyeweerd, op. cit., pp. 11, 14, 15.

¹¹ *Mededelingen*, op. cit., p. 3.

¹² Dooyeweerd, op. cit. p. 114.

Several additional titles are available in English:

H. Dooyeweerd, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, Vol. II has just been published. Vol. III and IV are yet to appear. This will complete the translation of Dooyeweerd's systematic treatment of the *Wetsidee*, first published in 1935-36.

J. M. Spier, *An Introduction to Christian Philosophy*, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company. Spier's fourth edition of his *Inleiding In De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee*, Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1950, contains an extended but not complete bibliography of Dutch publications by adherents of the *Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee*.

J. M. Spier, *Christianity and Existentialism*, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.

Calvin Forum has carried a series of articles during the year 1954 which discusses various aspects of the Philosophy of the Idea of Law.

OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT (Concluded)

ROGER R. NICOLE

5. *The New Testament authors sometimes recorded quotations made by others.* Not all quotations found in the New Testament are introduced by the writers themselves for the purpose of illustrating their narrative or bolstering their argument, for they sometimes simply recorded quotations made by some of those who appear in the history which they relate: Jesus, Paul, Peter, James, Stephen, the Jews, Satan. In two cases we have a record of a reading — Luke 4: 18, 19 and Acts 8: 32, 33. The New Testament writers had at their disposal at least three legitimate methods of recording such quotations:

a. They could translate them directly from the original text.

b. They could use the existing Septuagint and quote according to this version, as suggested under principle no. 1.

c. They could translate directly from the form used by the person quoting, often presumably an Aramaic translation of the Hebrew text. A few words are needed here only with reference to the last possibility. Of course, we expect the persons quoting, at least those who were inspired (Jesus, Paul, Peter, James, and possibly Stephen), to quote accurately; therefore, in these cases no divergence from the original can be explained by the mere fact that somebody else's quotation is recorded. Since, however, probably most of these quotations were originally made in Aramaic according to a current oral or written Aramaic translation, certain discrepancies between the Old Testament and the New, which cannot be accounted for on the basis of the Septuagint, may have their true explanation in the use of this probable Aramaic version.¹

6. *Other principles whose application must be limited.* Under this heading we need to consider briefly three additional principles of explanation of apparent discrepancies between the text of the Old Testament and that of the New. These principles, in the writer's opinion, may well be the ground of a legitimate explanation, but they ought to be handled with the utmost care and one should have recourse to them only as a last resort, because indiscriminate use of them may tend to overthrow the very thing for which the Conservative scholar contends in the doctrine of plenary inspiration, to wit: the assured present authority of the Bible.

a. *The texts are uncertain.* Everybody knows that the ancient texts now in our hands are not altogether exact reproductions of the original manuscripts. In the study of the quotations we have to deal almost exclusively with the Greek text of the New Testament, the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and the Septuagint translation. The New Testament possesses a degree of certainty unequalled by any other ancient text transmitted to us by manuscript. There are, however, numerous variants and instances in which the best authorities are divided in a puzzling way. Thus, while arguments based on the general scope of a passage or on several different passages have a probability practically equal to certainty, arguments based on single details — and many criticisms of the quotations are of this kind — must always be handled with utmost care. We cannot always preclude completely the possibility that our text of the Greek New Testament may be corrupt at a given point.

The text of the Old Testament has received the most painstaking attention from the Jews, who exercised the utmost care in its preservation. The recently discovered Manuscripts of the Cave have tended to underscore the reliability of the Masoretic text. Nevertheless we cannot glibly equate the latter with the original autographs, and

It is conceivable that a New Testament writer has preserved a true reading of the Hebrew, current in his time, which the Masoretic text exhibits in corrupt form.²

The text of the Septuagint is quite corrupted. There were three classes of manuscripts widely divergent in places as early as the time of Jerome. Thus, the present readings that we have may often fail to represent this translation in the form available to the New Testament authors.

In the case of the quotations, all these different textual uncertainties must be considered, and sometimes the principle of compound probability must be applied. Nevertheless, the present writer views it as dangerous to indulge in a boundless correction of the text on the grounds of the quotations, and he has not found any instance in the New Testament where such a correction might appear as the only possible legitimate explanation of the difficulty. If one begins arbitrarily, that is, without the support of actual manuscript evi-

dence, to introduce corrections in the text of the Old or of the New Testament, there appears to be hardly any limit to the length to which one might go along this line and no logical stopping place on this road.

b. *In the quotations, as well as in other inspired texts, the personality of the writers has been respected.* It is an unsearchable mystery that the Holy Spirit could inspire the sacred writings so as to communicate His inerrancy to their very words and, at the same time, respect the freedom and personalities of the writers so that we might easily recognize their style and their characteristics. The same thing is true of the quotations, for there also we may recognize the individuality of the writers in their use of them, in the sources employed, and in the method of quoting. Perhaps some slight modifications of the original text may be explained on the ground of this principle in a way which is not inconsistent with the highest view of inspiration. Elsewhere in Scripture we do find round numbers, slight differences in parallel passages, etc. — all things which are perfectly legitimate adaptations of the Holy Spirit to human habits and conventions. Although this remark may have its application in reference to quotations, it must be urged that it should be handled with utmost care.

There is a dangerous distortion of this principle in the numerous appeals made by some to slips of memory in order to explain certain difficulties. If the New Testament authors might have slips of memory when quoting the Old, they could also have them when recording the life of Jesus or of the early church, and the whole principle of inerrancy would be seriously undermined. Therefore, the above principle should be used with such discrimination that a basic surrender will not be made of the very point at issue. In fact, as Toy himself recognized — and he cannot easily be charged with being biased in favor of inspiration — so many quotations show verbal agreement with the Septuagint “that we must suppose either that they were made from a written text, or, if not, that the memory of the writers was very accurate.”³

c. *The Spirit of God was free to modify the expressions that He inspired in the Old Testament.* This again is a principle which must be handled with great care lest its application lead to a destruction of the idea of verbal inspiration. In the present writer’s opinion, Conservatives have been too ready to advocate this approach when other less precarious solutions might be proposed. Nevertheless, in this connection, one may well give assent to the judgment of Patrick Fairbairn;

Even in those cases in which, for anything we can see, a closer translation would have served equally well the purpose of the writer, it may have been worthy of the inspiring Spirit, and perfectly consistent with the fullest inspiration of the original Scripture, that the sense should have been given in a free current translation; for the principle was thereby sanctioned of a rational freedom in the handling of the Scrip-

ture, as opposed to the rigid formalism and superstitious regard to the letter, which prevailed among the Rabbinical Jews. . . . The stress occasionally laid in the New Testament upon particular words in passages of the Old . . . sufficiently proved what a value attaches to the very form of the Divine communications and how it is necessary to connect the element of inspiration with the written record as it stands. It shows that God's words are pure words, and that, if fairly interpreted, they cannot be too closely pressed. But in other cases, when nothing depended upon a rigid adherence to the letter, the practice of the sacred writers, not scrupulously to stickle about this, but to give prominence simply to the substance of the revelation, is fraught also with an important lesson; since it teaches us that the letter is valuable only for the truth couched in it, and that the one is no further to be prized and contended for, than may be required for the exhibition of the other.⁴

Conclusion

a. In the above remarks we have addressed ourselves only to the problem of verbal differences between the Old Testament texts and the New Testament quotations. The question of the alleged difference of the meaning between the original Hebrew in its context and the sense that is given to the quotation by the New Testament authors should also be the object of a careful investigation. Yet the problems raised in this area are probably less embarrassing to the advocate of plenary inspiration, since few people will have the presumption of setting forth their own interpretation as normative when it runs directly counter to that of the Lord Jesus and of the Apostles, while verbal differences are simply matters of fact. This whole subject is closely related to the great topic of Messianic prophecy, and even a summary discussion of the principles involved would take us too far afield.

b. It may not be out of order to quote here a remark of Warfield with which the writer is in hearty agreement:

We are not bound to harmonize the alleged phenomena with the Bible doctrine; and if we cannot harmonize them save by strained or artificial exegesis they would be better left unharmonized. We are not bound, however, on the other hand, to believe that they are unharmonizable, because we cannot harmonize them save by strained exegesis. Our individual fertility in exegetical expedients, our individual insight into exegetical truth, our individual capacity of understanding are not the measure of truth. If we cannot harmonize without straining, let us leave unharmonized. It is not necessary for us to see the harmony that should exist or even be recognized by us as existing. But it is necessary for us to believe the harmony to be possible and real, provided that

we are not prepared to say that we clearly see that on any conceivable hypothesis . . . the harmony is impossible — if the trustworthiness of the Biblical writers who teach us the doctrine of plenary inspiration is really safeguarded to us on evidence which we cannot disbelieve. In that case every unharmonized passage remains a case of difficult harmony and does not pass into the category of objections to plenary inspiration.⁵

c. It has been the writer's privilege to devote substantial time to the consideration of all quotations of the Old Testament in the New. This study has led him to the conclusion that the principles mentioned above can provide in every case a possible explanation of the difficulties at hand in perfect harmony with the doctrine of the inerrancy of the Scripture. There is no claim here that all of the difficulties are readily dispelled or that we are in possession of the final solution of every problem. Nevertheless, possible, if not plausible, explanations are at hand in every case known to us. It is thus with some confidence that this presentation is made and it gives joy to state that the quotations, which at the start of the work were viewed as one of the major difficulties to be raised against the doctrine of plenary inspiration, have turned out to be, upon examination, a confirmation of this doctrine, rather than an invalidation of it. With this concur the judgments of men who can certainly be advanced as impartial witnesses in statements such as the following, made precisely with references to Old Testament quotations in the New:

For our evangelist [Matt.], the Scripture is literally inspired. Everything it says is true; and not with a relative truth subordinated to the general sense of the context, but with an absolute truth, each word having its peculiar value. Every word of Scripture is the manifestation of a special will of God.⁶

We know, from the general tone of the New Testament, that it regards the Old Testament, as all Jews then did, as the revealed and inspired Word of God, and clothed with His authority.⁷

Our authors look upon the words of the Old Testament as immediate words of God, and adduce them expressly as such, even those of them which are not at all related as direct sayings of God. They see nothing at all in the sacred volume which is simply the word of its human author and not at the same time the very Word of God Himself. In all that stands "written" God Himself speaks to them.⁸

In quoting the Old Testament, the New Testament writers proceed consistently from the presupposition that they have Holy Scripture in hand. The actual author is God or the Holy Spirit, and both, as also frequently the *graphe*, are represented as speaking either directly or through the Old Testament writers.⁹

Such statements from such authors mean more than anything a Conservative scholar could say. They may be allowed to stand at the end of this study as expressing in a striking way the writer's own conclusions on the subject.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ It would appear that in those cases alone where others' quotations are adduced can this hypothesis be rightfully used to explain difficulties, for one would hardly claim that the New Testament authors writing in Greek could legitimately introduce on their own account mis-translations drawn from an Aramaic version. This remark limits sharply the validity of Eduard Boehl's explanations based frequently, and indiscriminately for the whole New Testament on the hypothesis of what he calls the "Volksbibel". Eduard Boehl, *Die Alttestamentlichen Citate im Nuen Testament*, Vienna: W. Braumeller, 1878.
- ² C. H. Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884, p. xix.
- ³ C. H. Toy, *op. cit.*, p. xx.
- ⁴ Patrick Fairbairn, *op. cit.*, pp. 453, 454.
- ⁵ B. B. Warfield, "The Real Problem of Inspiration", *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, IV, 1893, pp. 215, 216; reproduced in *Revelation and Inspiration*, p. 219 and *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, pp. 219, 220.
- ⁶ Massébieau, *Examen des Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Evangile de Matthieu*, Paris: Fishbacher, 1885, p. 74.
- ⁷ C. H. Toy, *op. cit.*, p. xxx.
- ⁸ R. Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik*, Gotha: Perthes, 1869, 2nd edition, pp. 177, 178.
- ⁹ E. Huehn, *Die Alt-testamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testament*, Tuebingen: Mohr, 1900, p. 272.

PERSONALIA

Hudson T. Armerding is Dean and Professor of History at Gordon College. Dean Armerding is a graduate of Wheaton College, A. B. He received his M.A. from Clark University (Thesis: "The Halibut Treaty of 1924 between Canada and the United States"). The Ph.D. was conferred upon him by the University of Chicago (Dissertation: "Some Contributions of the China Inland Mission to China"). He taught in the Division of Social Science at Wheaton College before coming to Gordon in 1948 as Professor of History.

During the second World War, Dean Armerding served as a commissioned officer in the United States Navy and spent nearly three years in the Pacific area. He is at present a Lieutenant Commander in the Naval Reserve.

He is a member of the Scholastic Honor Society of Wheaton College and of Pi Gamma Mu, National Social Science Honor Society. He is a fellow of the American Scientific Affiliation and a member of the Far Eastern Association, the National Education Association, The New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the United States Naval Institute.

David L. Franz is Assistant Professor of History at Gordon College. He is a graduate of Providence Bible Institute. He received his A.B. from Wheaton College, at which institution he was honored with membership in Pi Kappa Delta, National Forensic Honor Society, and in Pi Gamma Mu, National Social Science Honor Society. The A.M. in history was received at Harvard University where Professor Franz is completing his doctoral dissertation in the field of philosophy of history. For the year 1954-55 he has been the holder of a Fulbright Fellowship to the Netherlands. There he has been attending the Free University of Amsterdam majoring in philosophy and Utrecht University where he has been working under Professor Peter Geyl in history.

Donald F. Tweedie, Jr. is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Psychology at Gordon College. Dr. Tweedie received his A.B. in Th. from Gordon College and his Ph.D. from Boston University Graduate School. His doctoral dissertation was entitled "The Concept of Dread in the Thought of Kierkegaard and Neidegger". He also attended the University of Maine; Boston University, College of Liberal Arts; Harvard University; and Fuller Theological Seminary. Dr. Tweedie served in the U. S. Army Air Force during World War II. He is a member of The Evangelical Theological Society and The Society of Phi Alpha Chi.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Nationalism and Social Communication, by KARL W. DEUTSCH. Boston: The Technology Press of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1953. 292 pp. \$5.00.

There are two reasons for reviewing this book. The first is the importance of the subject it treats and the second is the method of treatment. The subject is nationalism and consequent internal and international problems, while the method is that of the new cybernetical school. The thinking Christian can neglect neither.

In a day when many peoples are clinging tenaciously to their right to rule themselves and their right to a destiny of autonomy, others are changing their home and their allegiance. Countries are combining into federations or seceding from one another, often with conflict. Why is this? It is Deutsch's purpose to aid us in understanding the underlying nationalistic processes in a tentative and exploratory manner. He asks,

"What, then, is ethnic nationality? Under what conditions will a government or a political organization find it an asset? Under which a liability? What is the relation of this nationality to economic life, to incomes, opportunities, and expectations? And how may it become so important to individuals as to override their economic interests, and even their interest in self-preservation?" (p.v.)

The book essays a beginning in understanding such problems.

After surveying some of the more important attempts to account for the structure and development of nationalism, Deutsch reviews different social sciences, certain aspects of which may be used in constructing concepts corresponding to the above factors in peoples. From here, the method of analysis is similar to that developed by the cybernetics of his colleague, Norbert Weiner, in discussing communication systems. This is a theory of processes in modern electronic computers and servo-mechanisms which have the ability to alter continuously their activity in response to signals from their own past performance (like missiles which correct their direction to follow a plane undergoing evasive action). The proponents consider the models so derived to be a much superior analogy to animal learning and activity than the mechanistic views using traditional concepts.

Deutsch carries this over into, not only humans singly, but their group activity as well. Hence, he feels that cybernetical techniques may be fruitfully applied to explaining and predicting national and international activities of learning and change, to showing the connectivity of memory and habitual attitudes of groups, and to testing predictions of behavior and the ability to convey between peoples meaningful and understandable information.

A people is thus defined as a community capable of efficiently transmitting information among their various parts (p. 81). By using methods developed in modern electronics for measuring distortion in transmitting patterned relationships one can decide whether the channels of communication are efficient or not and seek to determine how such distortion influences the activity of the people or peoples. Cultures consist of patterns and channels of habit, memory, and preferences and the information is knowledge, values, traditions, news, gossip and commands (p. 64). Nationalism is thus basically a question of communicating information and the efficiency of doing so varies with social, political, and economic conditions. This will be intimately related with how well peoples can understand one another and work together.

The basic philosophy of the book is not new. It has always been the hope of some to treat organisms and societies in a way amenable to description by mathematics. History becomes in prediction the solution of an equation. Such must imply a complete behaviorism with respect to human endeavor. One need not criticize the philosophy here but a few remarks on the thesis may be pertinent. First, it seems to the writer obvious that information is never transmitted as a pattern alone but as symbols given varied meaning with the time, place, and condition of the communicants. Hence one must be careful to correct for this in a way which Deutsch's preliminary efforts fail to do. The cybernetics model of society is thus overly simple and leads easily to misuse and misunderstanding. Secondly, there is a tendency to assume that clarification of a problem is to answer it. The values and aspirations of a person or a nation are made apparent as to their role in world affairs, but the tenor of the book implies that the model makes such simply a matter of scientific analysis. Traces of much popular modern philosophy will be apparent here. Again, there is the assumption that the perfect world is one in which perfect communication obtains without the fixing of any value or the by-passing of any experience. There is truth here, but a Christian cannot accept such a whole-hearted "continuous revelation" and relativity of norms. Do we not have the "perfect information" and is it not a fixed value? We cannot see the perfection save by revelation — such knowledge as to its nature cannot come from some preconceived conception. Indeed Deutsch fails to provide the conception!

There is much in the book which is real food for thought and germinal in its usefulness. The author is an expert and ought to be given our attention as Christians. We may not agree with his thesis but we cannot help but see new facets to the problems of the mission field, our sociological problems at home, the questions of the U. N., and the factors involved in communicating the "glad tidings of salvation".

— *Thomas H. Leith*

Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions, by EUGENE A. NIDA. New York: Harper & Bros., 1954. XIV + 306 pp. \$4.00.

Missionary sympathy without missionary empathy is dead. Succinctly, this is what *Customs and Cultures* is about. The syncretism resulting from Christian doctrine and the missionary's subculture is often so complete that only the keenest perception is able to divide it asunder.

Bathing frequently, brushing one's teeth, abstaining from beer, tobacco, and betel nut, and refusing to eat clams or oysters, have all been preached by various missionaries as symbols of the "new life in Christ Jesus" (255).

In refreshingly revolutionary manner, the author observes: "It is high time that we rid ourselves of the 'Foreign Mission' complex, in which there is special virtue in being foreign" (253).

How shall this catastrophic cleavage be accomplished? Anthropology, suggests Dr. Nida, is the answer. A failure to appreciate its usefulness may "result in consecrated endeavor being dissipated in fruitless undertakings" (257). The criterion of successful missionary enterprise is not necessarily multiplicity of converts, "but . . . an integrated, self-propagating church, adjusted to the problems and needs of the surrounding culture" (251).

Dr. Nida's wide experience in linguistics — the most intimate approach to understanding culture — makes him supremely suited to write of the relevance of anthropology to missions. His procedure is commendably objective, in spite of an expected Christian bias. In fact, some readers well-versed in American, Christian tradition but having little anthropological perspective, might wonder at times on whose side the author is! To put his mind at ease, such a person need only to consult the last chapter and the section entitled "In Defense of Missionaries" to discover — if he has not already done so — that the exotic science of anthropology has not denatured Dr. Nida's Christianity. Here he acknowledges certain inevitable incompatibilities between the Gospel and culture.

We are informed in the preface to expect no extensive analyses of cultural traits or anthropological procedure which would appear fastidious to non-specialists. Even so, the author treats a useful portion of anthropological theory and method under such lively titles as "Shocks and Surprises," "Rhyme and Reason," "Race and Ranting," "Hoes and Headaches," and other such delights. Illustrations have been chosen for their pertinence to missionary interests.

As an example, from the first chapter, we cite an interesting analogy between faith and culture:

. . . No person has attained unto the full measure of faith, but all "press on to the mark", so equally no one cultural manifestation of

the Christian life (including our own) has arrived at perfection, but each has its unique contribution to make and each should be permitted to make it (23).

In the excellent chapter on attitudes towards race, it is observed that one reason for Mohammedanism's successful spread in Tanganyika has been its lack of racial barriers. How has Christianity stood on this score?

Dr. Nida does not gloss over the mistakes Christian missionaries have made when, in trying to assist a foreign group, they have actually contributed to the undermining of its society.

Missionaries . . . have had a share in such developments as the breakdown of clan loyalties (by denouncing respect for ancestors), lessening of community responsibility (by substituting mission authority for that of the tribal elders), personality disintegration (. . . by weaning them away from old loyalties without giving them a corresponding sense of belonging to something else), and diminution of artistic skills . . . (by apparent wholesale condemnation of all sculpture, music and folk dancing) (258-9).

There are only a few minor details, fortuitously noticed by the reviewer which might be opened to question. For example, we read that "primitive societies undergo changes, but rarely are they consciously directed reforms" (226). In a measure this is true, but one might wonder if the common phenomenon of nativistic movements such as the Modekgnei in Micronesia (mentioned later on by the author) do not border on conscious reform.

It is true that kinship ties play an important part in primitive societies, but to say they commonly take precedence over wealth status (224-5) is somewhat misleading. Not infrequently the reverse is true. Note for only one the case of the Ifugao discussed on page 86.

The example of similarity of form and difference of function between pyramids in Egypt and America (238) has lost much of its significance (if it ever had any) since the discovery a few years ago of the fabulous tomb in the Temple of the Inscriptions at Palenque in southern Mexico. (This still does not indicate trans-Atlantic contact, however).

Theologians should particularly enjoy the section of the second chapter dealing with cultural relativism. In showing the relationship of Biblical events to cultural patterns, Dr. Nida infuses new understanding into such questions as polygamy, slavery and divorce. Relativism within the Bible is also discussed, as for example Paul's being "all things to all men." Worthy of quotation is the following:

Biblical relativism is not a matter of inconsistency, but a recognition of the different cultural factors which influence standards and actions.

While the Koran attempts to fix for all time the behavior of Muslims,

the Bible clearly establishes the principle of relative relativism, which permits growth, adaptation, and freedom, under the Lordship of Jesus Christ (52).

The footnote (and these are an integral part of the text) on "Biblical relativism" is further stimulating:

The only absolute in Christianity is the triune God. Anything which involves man, who is finite and limited, must of necessity be limited, and hence relative. Biblical relativism is an obligatory feature of our incarnational religion, for without it we would either absolutize human institutions or relativize God (282).

Customs and Cultures will afford entertaining and stimulating reading for anyone. It should not be considered (nor was it intended so) an introduction to anthropology in the usual sense. But it masterfully succeeds in capturing anthropological atmosphere, especially as it should be understood by the missionary.

The book opens: "Good missionaries have always been good 'anthropologists'." It could well end: Good "anthropologists" will always be better missionaries.

— H. Wade Seaford, Jr.

Christianity in Education, by MARTIN HEGLAND. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1954. 105 pp. \$1.75.

The author, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Religion of St. Olaf College, has added one more voice to the growing insistence of educators across our land that education take into account the Christian tradition. The book, we are told in the Preface, "represents a distillation of study and reflection over a period of half a century and is meant to be helpful to the cause of Christian education." It is made up of a series of chapters which consider History, Philosophy, Psychology, Literature, Languages, Natural Sciences, Social Studies, Music, Art, Home-making, Health, Religion and Extra-curricular Activities. The procedure in dealing with each of these subject-fields is:

First, a brief orientation as to the meaning and significance of each field as a part of the total cultural picture. Second, an endeavor has been made to show the function of education in transmitting the content of each subject. Third, the Christian emphasis on each area has been stressed.

The author says, "These are mere beginnings" in the way the various subjects of the curriculum may be related to Christianity. That this is merely suggestive is easily understood when all of these areas are surveyed in only 105 pages.

The author of this book and the Christian colleges he has served represent the Lutheran tradition in Christian education. Yet there is not one word in the volume to connect it with that philosophy of education which has been in the forefront of the battle against secularism in education. Rather, the

contrary is true. Acknowledgement is given throughout to the Edward W. Hazen Foundation booklets, "Religious Perspectives of College Teaching."

The Hazen Foundation as well as the Danforth Foundation are allied with the Religious Education Association now almost fifty years old. The former was set up to aid the cause of religion in education. The latter has for its purpose "to inspire the religious forces of our country with the educational ideal, to inspire the educational forces of our country with the religious ideal, and, to keep before the public mind the ideal of moral and religious education and the sense of its need and value."¹ Its charter members included such men as: Shailer Mathews, George A. Coe, William Rainey Harper and John Dewey. Its official voice, *Religious Education*, devoted the September-October 1954 issue to a "Symposium on "Religion in Education""² which represented contributions from nine men in the educational field. More recently this movement has produced interest resulting in such a book as "Not Minds Alone" by Kenneth Irving Brown.³ That the impact of this movement is gaining force is seen in the present popularity of magazine articles and even newspaper copy on the vacuum created by secularism in education. The whole current issue of *Phi Delta Kappan* (April, 1955) is devoted to "Religion in Education".⁴

From the book under discussion down to the last mentioned articles, the contemplated problem is how to add "Religion" to education. It does not propose to alter the educational foundation of this structure which must "reflect our culture", but only to add a hitherto missing ingredient. From Hegland to the Religious Education Association to *Phi Delta Kappan* the scheme is the same. It differs only in degree. Dr. Hegland would add far more of the kind of thing which would greatly please most evangelicals. It is one of the happy inconsistencies of epistemology that from Columbia, where the "million-dollar" team of Dewey and Kilpatrick for so many years did everything to eliminate external authority from education, voices such as that of Dr. F. Johnson Ernest and now Dr. Martin Hegland are raised to augment education with Christianity. However, as far as changing the basic character of secularism in education, this method cannot achieve the desired result.

To use the method here advised is like putting a fresh coat of paint over a termite-ridden building and expecting the religious coating to hold up the tottering structure. A God-centered basis for education is the only way to displace an entrenched secularism in education. I believe the Lutheran tradition of Christian education is at least prepared to demonstrate this principle. But not one word on this important matter appears in *Christianity in Education*.

We must begin with God, man in His image, and the purpose of redeemed man to be "perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." A wholly new educational structure must arise; the termites of secularism have consumed the old. Such an effort is being made by the National Union of Christian Schools

in Chicago. Teachers and parents who would see principle and practice properly conjoined, may refer to the 378 page publication *Course of Study for Christian Schools*⁵ and the syllabus, "Philosophy of Education".⁶

The two best chapters in "Christianity in Education" are the first and the last: "The Challenging Opportunity" and "The Total Impact". The jacket is very attractive, but the chapter numbers in the Table of Contents are missing and the index is inadequate.

FOOTNOTES

¹ "Purpose of the Convention," 1905, from *Religious Education*, No. 2, April, 1906.

² *Religious Education*, Sept.-Oct. 1954, published bimonthly by the Religious Education Association, 545 W. 111th St., New York 25, N. Y.

³ *Not Minds Alone*, Some Frontiers of Christian Education, by Kenneth Irving Brown. Harper and Brothers, 1954. \$3.00.

⁴ *Phi Delta Kappan*, A Journal for the Promotion of Research, Service, and Leadership in Education. Vol. 36, No. 7. April 1955. 2034 Ridge Road, Homewood, Ill.

⁵ *Course of Study for Christian Schools*, ed. by the Educational Com. of the Nat. Union of Christian Schools. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1947.

⁶ "Philosophy of Education." A syllabus by Mark Fakkema. The Nat. Assoc. of Christian Schools, 542 S. Dearborn St., Chicago.

— Charles G. Schauffele

Signs and Symbols in Christian Art, by GEORGE FERGUSON. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954. 346 pp. \$10.00.

This is a large and beautiful volume with more than 350 illustrations, 16 in full color. The illustrations are from paintings of the Renaissance. In essence, this publication contains and explains the sources and uses of signs and symbols that are to be found in Christian art. The volume is divided into fourteen sections including such diversified subjects as Animals, Birds and Insects, The Human Body, The Virgin Mary, Religious Dress, Religious Objects: their significance in Christianity and their meaning in religious paintings.

The author, the Reverend George Ferguson, is the rector of Saint Philip's in the Hills Episcopal Parish, Tucson, Arizona. Undoubtedly, because of his liturgical background, Mr. Ferguson perhaps has a greater interest in and appreciation of Christian symbolism than the non-liturgical mind. The publication of this book should be, however, of great value and importance to all Christians, for symbolism is a vital part of our lives. It contains an extensive index of signs and symbols associated with the Christian religion. The author presents a clear and simple test accompanied by beautiful illustrations. This volume is valuable for light reading or for profound study. Since the material is neatly arranged in sections, under various headings, one may turn to any page and find with ease assistance in the study of the art of Christian symbolism. It not only contributes meaning and insight to the signs and symbols found in Christian art, it also helps to bring about a deeper understanding and appreciation of Christianity itself.

In Christian art the signs and symbols are used interchangeably: "A sign is a symbol; a symbol is a sign." But a sign *represents*; it points to something.

For example, the cross represents the Christian faith and points to Christ's crucifixion. A symbol *resembles*. "It has acquired a deeper meaning than the sign, because it is more completely identified with what it represents, and its character is derived from what is known by it." Thus, the Cross symbolizes God's love for humanity in the offering of His Son for the sins of the world.

Section II explains the meaning and uses of certain plants such as the bulrush, the hyssop, the lily, the palm, the thistle, and the thorn; their significance in Christianity and their place in religious paintings. Each section deals specifically with the various phases of Christian art as depicted by the great Renaissance artists.

There are very few books available on this subject. Ferguson's selection of words and his excellent descriptions give the student of art most enjoyable and easy reading. He has written in such a style that all might comprehend and enjoy the contents and illustrations. For example, under Section XIV, entitled "Artifacts", he speaks of the bow as the symbol of war and of worldly power: "Behold," said the Lord to the prophet Jeremiah, "I will break the bow of Elam, the chief of their might" (Jeremiah 49: 35).

Signs and Symbols in Christian Art is to be highly recommended to every Christian interested in the uses of the signs and symbols found in Christian art. Indeed it should be in every Christian's library. It is unique in its presentation and will be stimulating and informative to those who are vitally interested in this particular aspect of our Christian heritage. It will greatly enhance the reader's knowledge concerning symbolism in Christian art.

— Robert L. d'Entremont

ITEMS OF INTEREST FOR REVIEW READERS

T. H. LEITH

ARTICLES

American Scientist, April 1955, VANNEVAR BUSH, "Science and Progress."

Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, March 1955, P. PEACHY, "Toward an Understanding of the Decline of the West" and F. E. HOUSER, "Reflections on Sociology and Evangelism."

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March 1955. An issue on *Contemporary Africa: Trends and Issues*.

Atlantic Monthly, March 1955, WALTER LIPPMANN, "The Adversaries of Liberal Democracy." Also April, JOHN S. DICKEY, "Conscience and the Undergraduate," a challenge to the college.

Bible Translator, January 1955, F. W. GROSHIDE, "The Translation of Quotations from the Old Testament in the New."

- Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1955, MERRILL F. UNGER, "Great Archaeological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the Old Testament." Part one of a series.
- Confluence*, April 1955, a symposium on the problems of religion dealing with the relation of religion to ideologies, history, revival, and man.
- Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, March 1955, PIERRE AUGER, "Who? Why? How?" A positivistic world view. This scientific absolutism is criticised by Reinhold Niebuhr in "Limitations of the Scientific Method."
- Christian Scholar*, March 1955, CHARLES MALIK, "The Spiritual Significance of the United Nations." Also a discussion by Curtis Larson on "The Intellectual Crisis of the Colleges."
- Current History*, February 1955, a whole issue on Russia's Foreign Policy.
- Christian Life*, March 1955, the first article of a series on the Story of Creation dealing with "The Origin of the Universe."
- Diogenes*, Autumn 1954, GEORG DRZYMALLA, "Freedom and Authority." An analysis of liberty and responsibility.
- Harper's*, March 1955, PETER DRUCKER, "America's Next Twenty Years." Discusses the future of the economy, of education, and of automation.
- His*, April 1955, W. S. LASOR, "Beyond Biblical Criticism" and L. D. SULLIVAN, "Are We Writing Great Christian Literature?"
- Hibbert Journal*, January 1955, ANTONY FLEW, "Divine Omnipotence and Human Freedom" and an excellent "Survey of Recent Philosophical and Theological Literature."
- International Affairs*, January 1955, SIR ERNEST BARKER, "Dr. Toynbee's Study of History" and a short article by Toynbee himself on "What I am Trying to Do."
- International Review of Missions*, October 1954, C. W. RANSON, "The Christian World Mission in the Perspective of History."
- Journal of Higher Education*, February 1955, THEODORE BRAMELD, "Culture and Education."
- Journal of Philosophy*, February 17, 1955, GAIL KENNEDY, "The Hidden Link in Dewey's Theory of Evaluation." March 3, PAUL KURTZ, "Naturalistic Ethics and the Open Question."
- Main Currents in Modern Thought*, March 1955, LUDWIG VON BERTALANFFY, "General System Theory." An article consonant with the purpose of the above periodical as a discussion of the role in scientific and educational integration of unifying principles, conceptual models, and laws that run through levels of nature and manifest themselves as organization.
- Nation*, February 19, 1955, C. H. WADDINGTON, "Peril From A-Dust."
- New Biology*, April 1954, "The Origin of Life." A series by Haldane, Bernal, Pirie, and Pringle. Also, "Organisms as Physico-Chemical Machines," by H. Bray and K. White.

- Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, January 1955, a discussion of "The Cases of Germany and Japan."
- Religious Education*, March-April 1955, a symposium on Juvenile Delinquency.
- Review of Metaphysics*, December 1954, RICHARD KRONER, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*. A review of the first translated volume of the major work of the great Dutch Calvinistic scholar, Dooyeweerd. Also Leon Goldstein, "Bidney's Humanistic Anthropology," in the March 1955 issue.
- Saturday Review*, March 12, 1955, an editorial on the art of censorship. Also February 19, JUDGE ROBERT MORRIS, "Should Congress Investigate?" and the opposition opinion in the February 26 issue by Ernest Angell. BERTRAND RUSSELL in the April 2 issue on "Man's Duel With the Hydrogen Bomb."
- Science News Letter*, March 5, 1955, an article on the need of scientific manpower. Also "New Dangers of the H-Bomb."
- Scientific American*, April 1955, "Man Viewed as a Machine," by J. G. KEMENY. Discusses a machine which will reproduce itself.
- Scientific Monthly*, January 1955, W. KOHLER, N. RASHEVESKY, and W. S. McCULLOCH discuss "Organism and Machine," a question of the similarity of man to modern computers.
- Speech Monographs*, November 1954, "Dutch Treatises on Preaching: A List of Books and Articles."
- Sunday School Times*, a series by ROY L. ALDRICH. February 26, 1955, "A Brief History of Heresies;" March 5, "Neo-Orthodoxy and Modernism;" and March 12, "Neo-Orthodoxy Based on Philosophy."
- Yale Review*, Spring 1955, HENRY KISSINGER, "American Policy and Preventive War."

NEW PUBLICATIONS

- Practical Anthropology*, a Christian approach to anthropology, the allied problems of the mission field and the home field, and the questions of historical and physical anthropology. Editor: Robt. B. Taylor, 2330-3 Patterson Drive, Eugene, Oregon. Price: One dollar per year.
- Newsletter of Religious Inquiry*, an "attempt to act as a sounding board for the reflections of religiously-motivated persons who seek to integrate their religious faith with their total experience in this age of science." Obtainable free from J. H. Shrader, Waterville, Vermont.
- Sovereign Voices Library*. A reprinting of old classics by the giants of the reformed faith such as Robert Haldane, Thomas Goodwin, Richard Baxter, John Bunyan, Augustus Toplady, C. H. Spurgeon, John Owen and others. A real opportunity for spiritual fare not readily obtainable elsewhere. For information write to 446 S. First St., Louisville, Kentucky.

